


PB88-159959

Superfund Record of Decision (EPA Region
2): Haviland Complex, Town of Hyde Park
Dutchess County, New York, (First Remedial
Action), September 1987

(U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

30 Sep 87



U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service



TECHNICAL REPORT DATA		
(Please read instructions on the reverse before completing)		
1. REPORT NO. EPA/ROD/R02-87/046	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO. PR8 159959/AS
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE SUPERFUND RECORD OF DECISION Haviland Complex, NY First Remedial Action - Final	5. REPORT DATE September 30, 1987	
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE	
7. AUTHOR(S)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Same as box 12.	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	
	11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.	
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 401 M Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20460	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED Final ROD Report	
	14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE 800/00	
15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
16. ABSTRACT The Haviland Complex site consists of a planned development comprising 275 acres in the town of Hyde Park, NY. This development contains an apartment complex, a junior high school, an elementary school, a shopping center and a number of private homes. Beginning in October 1981, a local resident filed a complaint with the Dutchess County Health Department noting that his well water was foaming. Other complaints of water quality supply problems prompted a sampling program and sanitary survey of the Haviland area. Results of these tests indicated failure in nearby car wash and laundromat septic and sewage systems. In 1982, the laundromat installed a sand filter and a new tile field to handle the laundry effluent. Due to increasing concern over potential ground water contamination by volatile organic chemicals, the New York State Department of Health (NYDOH) began sampling wells in December 1982. In January 1983, the laundromat was ordered to disconnect the dry cleaning unit from the recently upgraded sewer disposal system and dispose of all spent cleaning fluids offsite with a licensed disposal firm. Continued evidence of contamination led to installation of two spray aeration systems in Haviland Complex wells. The primary contaminants of concern include: volatile organic chemicals (TCE, DCE, toluene, benzene, vinyl chloride and 1,1,1-trichloroethane) and heavy metals (cadmium, chromium, mercury and lead). (See Attached Sheet)		
17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		
a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Record of Decision Haviland Complex, NY First Remedial Action - Final Contaminated Media: gw, sediments Key contaminants: VOCs, heavy metals		
18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS (This Report) None	21. NO. OF PAGES 55
	20. SECURITY CLASS (This page) None	22. PRICE

ATTENTION

PORTIONS OF THIS REPORT ARE NOT
FULLY LEGIBLE. DUE TO THE IMPORTANCE
OF THE MATERIAL IT IS MADE AVAILABLE
TO THE PUBLIC. HOWEVER, IT IS THE BEST
REPRODUCTION AVAILABLE FROM THE COPY SENT
TO NTIS.

DOCUMENT COMPLETE AS PAGINATED PER SOURCE.

DIRECT QUESTIONS RESULTING FROM ILLEGIBILITY

TO:

U.S. EPA
OSWER - HSCD



Superfund Record of Decision:

Haviland Complex, NY

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

EPA/ROD/R02-87/046
Haviland Complex, NY
First Remedial Action - Final

16. ABSTRACT (continued)

The selected remedial action includes: connecting affected and potentially affected Haviland Complex residences to the Harbound Hills water distribution system; ground water extraction and treatment by air stripping, with discharge to surface water; pumping and cleaning out contaminated sediments from the local septic disposal system; and implementation of a monitoring system to ensure effectiveness of the remedy. The estimated capital cost of the remedial action is \$1,257,500 with annual O&M of \$105,500.

DECLARATION FOR THE RECORD OF DECISION

SITE NAME AND LOCATION

Haviland Complex, Town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, New York

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This decision document represents the selected remedial action for the Haviland site, developed in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and to the extent practicable, the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, 40 CFR Part 300, November 20, 1985.

STATEMENT OF BASIS

This decision is based upon the administrative record for the Haviland Complex site. A copy of the record is available for review at the information repository for the site and at the regional office. The following documents, which are part of the administrative record, were primarily relied upon in making this decision:

- Remedial Investigation Report, Haviland Complex Site, prepared by Holzmacher, McLendon and Murrell, P.C. June 1987
- Feasibility Study Report, Haviland Complex Site, prepared by Holzmacher, McLendon and Murrell, P.C. July 1987
- The attached Summary of Remedial Alternative Selection for the Haviland Complex Site
- The attached Responsiveness Summary for the site, which incorporates public comments received
- Staff summaries and recommendations

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED REMEDY

- Connect affected and potentially affected residents using ground water within the Haviland study area to the Harbour Hills water distribution system. Implementation of this alternative requires a financial commitment on behalf of the Town of Hyde Park to upgrade the Harbour Hills system to a level in compliance with New York State drinking water standards. The Town's contribution will be approximately 60%, depending upon final design details.
- Restore the aquifer to drinking water quality by extracting and treating contaminated ground water and discharging the effluent to surface water. Four strategically located extraction wells within the area of the contaminant plume will be required to offset the effects of ground-water mounding caused by the cessation of commercial/residential pumping and the addition of a public water supply. Local ground-water restoration will be provided by the use of a

packed tower air stripper for volatile organics removal and a precipitation system for metals removal, if deemed necessary. Treated water will be discharged to the Fall Kill. It is expected that this treatment system will restore the aquifer to drinking water quality within a period of 5-10 years.

- Implement source control measures consisting of pumping and cleaning out contaminated sediments from local septic disposal systems in order to minimize the potential of additional releases.
- Implement a monitoring program to ensure the effectiveness of the extraction/treatment alternative and the protection of public health and the environment.

These methods were determined to provide the highest degree of protection to public health and the environment from contaminated ground water.

DECLARATIONS


The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, attains Federal and State requirements that are applicable or relevant and appropriate, and is cost-effective. This remedy satisfies the preference for treatment that reduces the toxicity, mobility or volume of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants as a principal element. Finally, it is determined that this remedy utilizes permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies to the maximum extent practicable.

The State of New York has been consulted and agrees with the approved remedy (see attached letter).

The action will require future operation and maintenance activities to ensure the continued effectiveness of the remedy. The start-up activities, which will ensure the operational effectiveness of the design, will be considered part of the approved remedial action and eligible for Superfund monies for a period of up to one year. Additionally, up to ten years of aquifer remediation will also be considered remedial action which is eligible for Superfund monies. The remainder of the activities are considered operation and maintenance and are therefore the responsibility of New York State.

I have also determined that the action being taken will be appropriate when balanced against the future availability of Trust Fund monies for use at other sites.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1987
Date


Christopher J. Daggett

**SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVE SELECTION
HAVILAND COMPLEX
NEW YORK**

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region II
New York**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	1
II. SITE HISTORY	1
III. ENFORCEMENT	5
IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS	5
V. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION	
A-Alternative No. 1 - No Action	6
B-Alternative No. 2 - Source Control.	7
C-Alternative No. 4 - Ground-Water Extraction, Treatment and Discharge to Surface Waters	8
D-Alternative No. 5 - Ground-Water Extraction, Treatment and Discharge as a Public Water Supply	11
E-Alternative No. 10- Provide Public Water Supply To All Private Well Users Within the Study Area	12
VI. SELECTED REMEDY	
A-Description	15
B-Statutory Determinations	17

ATTACHMENTS

- A - NYSDEC Letter of Concurrence
- B - Responsiveness Summary

FIGURES

	<u>PAGE</u>
1 - Site Location Map	18
2 - RI/FS Study Area	19
3 - Phase I Well Locations (Piezometers)	20
4 - Phase II Well Locations (Monitoring Wells).	21
5 - Septic System Sampling Locations	22
6 - Inferred Area Impacted by Plume	23
7 - Contaminated Residential Wells, February 1987	24
8 - Contaminant Migration Time	25
9 - Flow Lines of Extraction Wells	26
10 - Proposed Extension of Harbours Hills Distribution System	27
11 - Modeled Ground-Water Contours	28
12 - Modeled Ground-Water Flow Directions	29

TABLES

PAGE

1 - Inorganic Water Quality Results For Rounds One and Two, Shallow Wells	30
2- Inorganic Water Quality Results For Rounds One and Two, Deep and Bedrock Wells	31
3 - Significant Volatile Organic Water Quality Results For Rounds One and Two, Shallow Wells	32
4 - Significant Volatile Organic Water Quality Results for Rounds One and Two, Deep and Bedrock Wells. .	33
5 - Inorganic Water Quality Results For Rounds One and Two-Fall Kill	34
6 - Organic Analysis For Septic System Sampling	35
7 - Inorganic Analysis For Septic System Sampling	37
8 - Estimated Costs for Remedial Action Alternatives	39
9 - Summary of Selected Remedy and Costs.	40

I. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The study area for this Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) covers 275 acres (0.43 square miles) in the Town of Hyde Park, New York (Figure 1) and includes an apartment complex, a junior high school, an elementary school, a shopping center and a number of private homes. The Haviland Complex site includes areas along Haviland Road, Wright Avenue and Route 9G, and is situated east of the FDR National Historic Site. The site area includes residential and non-residential wells.

The Town of Hyde Park is located within the northern extension of the Great Appalachian Valley within the Valley and Ridge province. Drainage systems are not well developed in the area which lead to numerous swampy conditions. The principal aquifer underlying the site is composed of stratified sand and gravel outwash which is recharged directly by precipitation. These stratified deposits are generally the most productive sources of ground-water in the area but are of limited extent.

Unconsolidated deposits are composed primarily of fractured slate and shale, lesser amounts of sandstone, limestone, and conglomerate. Most residents rely on shallow wells in the surficial sand and gravel aquifer. The majority of businesses and institutions utilize the unconsolidated, bedrock aquifer. Ground-water flow in the area is generally in a southeast direction towards the Fall Kill.

II. SITE HISTORY

The Haviland Apartments were constructed in the middle 1960's, with the adjacent shopping center and most of the local residences already existing (Figure 2). The local laundromat and dry cleaner, situated in the middle of the shopping center, have been in operation since the late 1960's.

Dutchess County Health Department documents note complaints concerning area ground-water quality beginning in October 1981. At this time, a local resident had registered a complaint that his well water was foaming and suggested that the Haviland Laundromat's sewage disposal system was failing. Shortly thereafter, concerns were voiced regarding water quality supply problems at the Haviland Apartments.

A sampling program and sanitary survey of the Haviland area, focusing on detergent and bacteriological parameters, began on December 2, 1981. During this month, the Haviland Laundromat sewage disposal system and two residential sewage disposal systems were tested by introducing dye into the systems and sampling for any residue in local wells. The results of these tests showed no direct contamination of area wells. Dye testing of the laundromat sewage system continued through January 1982 with negative results. However, the laundromat effluent was found to exceed ground-water standards set by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Continued testing of the laundromat sewage system confirmed that it was failing, when positive dye test results were obtained on February 1, 1982. This prompted additional testing of commercial sewage disposal systems within the Haviland Complex.

On March 26, 1982, the Dutchess County Department of Health found that the Haviland Car Wash septic system was failing. The Car Wash was also exceeding New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ground-water standards for effluent discharge. Subsequently, the old septic tank was replaced with a new one.

Additional study of the sanitary and water supply system at the Haviland Complex by the Dutchess County Department of Health continued through the Spring of 1982. On April 27, 1982, notice was given to disconnect a shallow (22') well located at the southeast corner of the apartment complex, from the Haviland Complex community water supply system. This well was installed during the previous winter, with the intention of using it solely to supply the laundromat. This added water source was planned to help the apartment complex eliminate the need to truck in water to supplement the potable well water supply. The Haviland Laundromat was also advised to implement a biological or pretreatment system (a sand filter) designed for the laundromat wastewater discharge.

Construction of a sand filter and tile field pad to handle the laundromat effluent was proposed and completed by December 1982. Concurrently, plans were made by the Dutchess County Department of Health to increase the scope of ground-water monitoring around the Haviland Complex. In particular, analyses of water samples were proposed to determine the presence of volatile organics.

Due to increasing concern over potential ground-water contamination by volatile organic chemicals in the Haviland Complex area the New York State Department of Health began sampling in December 1982. Subsequently, on January 19, 1983 the Haviland Laundromat was informed by the Dutchess County Department of Health that it should physically disconnect the dry cleaning unit from the recently upgraded sewage disposal system. All spent dry cleaning fluid was then to be barreled and removed from the site by a licensed carter.

In 1984, as a result of concentrations of trans-dichloroethene in the 20-60 ppb range, a spray aeration system was installed at one of the Haviland Apartment Complex wells. In 1985, a similar treatment system was installed for the contaminated well supply of the Haviland Laundromat. This well is located on the apartment complex property. Both treatment units are monitored by both the Dutchess County and New York State Departments of Health.

On June 14, 1985, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) requested that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) perform an immediate removal action to provide potable water to all affected residences within the study area. On September 3, 1985, EPA submitted a reply to NYSDEC indicating that the Haviland Complex Site did not meet the criteria established under the National Contingency Plan (NCP) for an immediate removal action, since the contamination levels were below EPA's 10-day Health Advisory levels for drinking water.

The Haviland Complex site was placed on the National Priorities List (NPL) in October 1984. The hydrogeologic investigation, the first step in the RI/FS process, began in August 1986 when a seismic survey was performed to provide insight into the bedrock locations and characteristics. Soil gas probing via HNu photoionization analyzer and an Organic Vapor Analyzer indicated high VOC readings and hot spots in the area of the tile fields. This was followed by the installation of 12 PVC piezometers to determine ground-water flow direction and 21 stainless steel monitoring wells (Figures 3 and 4) designed to obtain water quality and geologic information (i.e., depth to bedrock, hydraulic conductivity, etc.) in the study area. Geophysical logging investigations were also performed to evaluate the integrity of the bedrock. These investigations indicated that the bedrock yields little water and is not extensively fractured, and that ground water generally flows in a southeast direction toward the Fall Kill Creek.

After ground-water flow directions were established, 21 stainless steel monitoring wells were installed to sample for water quality parameters. These wells were located upstream of suspected sources of contamination, immediately downstream of the suspected sources and across the suspected flow of the contaminant plume. In addition, two bedrock wells were installed to evaluate the water quality and the hydraulic connection between the bedrock and overlying unconsolidated material. In some instances, contaminant levels were above the Safe Drinking Water Act's (SDWA) maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for drinking water.

Analysis of ground water at the Haviland Site indicated the metal contaminants- cadmium, chromium, mercury, selenium, silver, lead and arsenic, and volatile organics- benzene, styrene, toluene, 1,1-dichloroethene, trans-1,2-dichloroethene, acetone, methylene chloride, chlorobenzene, vinyl chloride, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, xylene, dichlorobenzene, trichloroethene and tetrachloroethene at concentrations ranging from trace quantities to excess of Federal and/or State drinking water standards (Tables 1,2,3,4). Further ground-water sampling would be conducted during the initial stage of the design phase in order to verify the presence of any metals.

The primary environmental exposure route of chemical contaminants at the Haviland Complex site is from drinking ground water and inhalation of volatile organic vapors while showering. Surface-water exposure via ingestion of fish from the Fall Kill and from soil was determined to be very low. Water quality analyses of the Fall Kill appear in Table 5.

The total cancer risk for each organic chemical ranged from 10^{-3} to 10^{-6} in order of magnitude. Vinyl chloride represented the highest potential risk (10^{-3} or 1 in 1000), while trichloroethylene the least (10^{-6} or 1 in 1,000,000) in the receptor area. These values are indicative of a worst case total lifetime exposure to maximum organic concentrations at an assumed constant rate. All noncarcinogenic contaminants were within acceptable intake levels, based on their respective subchronic and chronic intakes. Therefore, there are no health hazards based on these data at this point in time.

The source of contamination appears to be a number of septic systems in the area. These septic systems are connected to the Haviland Shopping Center, the Haviland Complex Apartments, and the Haviland Junior High School (Figure 5). The plume of contamination extends downstream of the sources, flowing south-southeast to near Haviland Road, traveling along Haviland Road, crossing Sunset Road between Haviland Road and Wright Avenue and eventually discharging to the Fall Kill (Figure 6). Water quality samples were taken of the Fall Kill and indicated that there was no significant impact by the plume.

Fourteen samples were collected from several commercial and institutional septic disposal systems at the Haviland Complex and adjacent junior high school facilities on June 12 and 13, 1987. Detectable levels of volatile organics were found in ten of the fourteen samples (Table 6). With the exception of five samples, inorganic compounds were detected at concentrations above their respective New York State Class GA Ground-water Discharge Standards (Table 7). Based on potential toxic effects from the consumption of heavy metals, contaminants of concern include cadmium, chromium, lead, and mercury. These metals were detected at concentrations up to 97 ppb for cadmium, 328 ppb for chromium, 1840 ppb for lead, and 330 ppb for mercury.

III. ENFORCEMENT

No negotiations with potentially responsible parties (PRP's) have been conducted up to the present. Data in the RI/FS indicates that the most likely locations where contamination entered the ground water were the septic systems connected to the Haviland Shopping Center, the Haviland Apartments, and Haviland Junior High School.

Prior to the initiation of the remedial design, notice letters will be sent to the potentially responsible parties. Should the PRP's decline to conduct future remedial activities, EPA will provide funding for such activities, but will retain its right to seek cost recovery for all EPA-funded response actions from said PRP's.

IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The primary concern of the community at the Haviland Complex site is for a safe domestic water supply. Although most residents no longer drink or cook with their water, they are concerned about the long-term effects of the contaminated water they may have consumed for an undetermined period prior to learning that a water problem existed. Several residents expressed the belief that their community is experiencing a higher-than-average incidence of certain types of cancers.

Interest in this site is relatively high, and some individuals have been extremely active in focusing attention on the site. Although residents have held meetings in their homes and

attended regular meetings of the town council, no groups have been formed as a result of the Haviland Complex site. A public meeting was held on August 17, 1987 at the Hyde Park Town Hall to discuss the RI/FS. The attached responsiveness summary outlines the numerous concerns of the public and the responses given by EPA and State officials. A transcript of the meeting is also available at the information repository and at the regional office.

The community generally agrees that the extension of the Harbour Hills water supply to affected residents would be the best method for providing potable water.

V. ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

The objective of the Feasibility Study was to evaluate and recommend a cost effective remedial action alternative which would minimize the risk to public health and the environment resulting from ground-water contamination at the site. Remedial action alternatives were subjected to a qualitative, preliminary screening based on technical feasibility, environmental, public health and order of magnitude cost criteria. Originally, eleven alternatives were evaluated; the screening process left only five for final consideration.

These remaining five were evaluated on the same basis but in a more detailed quantitative and qualitative manner. The following is a summary of the detailed evaluation presented in the Feasibility Study report dated July 17, 1987. The numbering system below is taken directly from the Feasibility Study.

A - Alternative No. 1 - No Action

This alternative does not provide for any remedial action for cleanup of the site. Ground-water contaminants identified during the RI which pose a threat to the public and the environment, include arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, selenium, silver and a variety of organic compounds including benzene, 1,1-dichloroethene, dichlorobenzene, styrene, tetrachloroethylene, toluene, 1,1-trichloroethane, trichloroethylene, and xylenes.

While not all of the private wells which supply the approximately one hundred (100) residential units in the study area show contaminant levels which exceed ground-water standards, it is not safe to assume that no further spreading of the plume will occur. Variations in contaminant source concentrations, seasonal-rainfall and ground-water withdrawal patterns can alter the extent of the plume, thereby affecting private wells which are clean at this time. Although contaminant concentrations show a decreasing concentration over time, the most recent residential well sampling data (DCDOH, February 1987) indicate that five private well samples (14 Haviland Road, 20 Haviland

Road, 22 Haviland Road, 24 Haviland Road, and 21 Wright Avenue) contain contamination in excess of acceptable NYSDOH water quality standards (Figure 7). All five of these samples exceeded the State's guidelines of 50 ppb for a single volatile organic compound and/or 100 ppb for total volatile organics. An additional three residential well samples (6 Haviland Road, 8 Haviland Road, and 26 Haviland Road) showed detectable levels of volatile organics.

Wells which are now impacted are very likely to remain contaminated until the plume is naturally flushed out. Based on ground-water modeling, contaminant transport time between the source and the Fall Kill is estimated between 4 and 100 years (Figure 8), although most of the contamination is expected to naturally attenuate within 20 years. Users of well water from the Haviland area will continue to experience a potential public health risk from exposure to contaminated ground water.

This alternative does not satisfy the remedial action objectives. Adverse impacts to the environment which will result from taking no action include continued contamination to the glacial aquifer, with a long term possibility of drawing the plume into the bedrock aquifer. Contamination of the bedrock is uncertain as the location of deep bedrock recharge is unknown. Due to dilution and aeration no significant environmental impact is expected in the Fall Kill. Users of well water from the Haviland area will continue to experience a potential public health risk from exposure to contaminated ground water which exceeds State and Federal drinking water standards due to the presence of volatile organics and possibly metals.

Adoption of this alternative would require continuation of an ongoing sampling and analysis program by the Dutchess County Health Department. This would include monitoring of well water and ground-water quality as well as sampling from dry wells and septic systems which are suspected contaminant sources. There is no cost associated with the no action alternative (Table 8).

B - Alternative No. 2 - Source Control

Source control remedial action consists of cleaning out contaminated dry wells, septic disposal systems and tile fields located within the Haviland study area which may be contributing to the contaminated ground-water plume and evaluating waste management practices. Liquid and sediment samples were collected from several commercial and institutional septic disposal systems at the Haviland Complex and adjacent junior high school facilities for volatile organic and inorganic priority pollutant compounds. Locations of the samples are illustrated in Figure 5. Sampling was conducted on June 12th and 13th, 1987 to determine the extent of contamination in the sediments within

the above structures. Detectable levels of volatile organics were found in ten of fourteen samples (Table 6). New York State Ground-Water Discharge Standards were used as the criteria for cleaning out the septic sludges since these standards are considered as applicable or relevant and appropriate. Elevated levels of cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury and silver were detected at concentrations above their respective New York Class GA Ground-Water Discharge Standards (Table 7).

Septic disposal systems with sediments containing unacceptable levels of volatile organic and/or heavy metals contamination would be excavated and replaced with clean sand. Contaminated disposal systems with elevated levels of metals and/or volatile organics would be pumped out. Materials excavated or pumped from these structures would be disposed at a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility. The septic disposal systems would be resampled and analyzed to verify that contaminated sediments had been removed. The disposal system would then be reconstructed or backfilled with clean sand. In addition, the sediments excavated from these disposal systems would be sampled to insure that the material is properly disposed.

This alternative does not present any adverse public health impacts, rather it indirectly offers some protection to the public against continued contaminated ground-water exposure. It does not provide for aquifer remediation or provide a safe drinking water supply but, serves only as a partial remedy. Excavating and cleaning out of septic disposal systems would minimize future releases of contaminants, assuming no additional contaminants are being released into the septic systems. It is also recommended that the County and/or State utilize all available authority to ensure that future septic system contamination does not occur.

Ground water (private wells) and surface water (Fall Kill) are the primary receptors to the contaminant plume. Based on the surface-water samples collected from the Fall Kill during the RI, contaminants detected were at concentrations which would not impact a Class C surface-water body (Table 5). Assuming that contaminant concentrations are released from the disposal sources (i.e., dry wells, septic systems) at past concentrations, the Fall Kill would continue not to be impacted by the release. However, the cleaning out of disposal systems of any contaminated sediments would offer additional protection for the Fall Kill should the concentrations of contaminants being released to the ground-water increase significantly over time. The present worth cost for source control is estimated at \$98,000 (Table 8).

C - Alternative No. 4 - Ground-Water Extraction, Treatment and Discharge to Surface Waters

This alternative includes aquifer restoration through containment and interception of the identified contaminant plume. Interception of contaminant-laden ground water would be accomplished through the use of 4 small diameter stainless steel wells which would supply water to a treatment facility. Proper sizing and location of these wells would result in containment of the plume through modification of the ground-water gradient caused by the cones of depression around each well.

Ground-water modeling was used to evaluate the effectiveness of several different pumping configurations. An efficient pumping strategy indicated placement of three wells roughly along the centerline of the inferred plume with an additional well on the south side of the plume. Figure 9 shows the locations of these wells. Each well would have a capacity of 20 gpm. The effectiveness of this configuration would depend upon implementation of source controls to prevent new contaminants from reaching the aquifer.

The identified plume would be removed through flushing of the contaminated ground water toward the four treatment wells. Small areas of the plume which are already near the Fall Kill will continue to migrate until they enter the creek.

Two treatment alternatives were evaluated for ground water contaminated with volatile organic compounds; packed tower air stripping and granular activated carbon adsorption. Both technologies are considered reliable and proven in the removal of volatile organics to low effluent concentrations. Worst case emissions were calculated to be insignificant in comparison to New York State Standards.

Treatment technology for metals removal consists of pH adjustment and precipitation which is widely used in industrial wastewater treatment. However, this technology may not achieve a reduction in metals concentrations to the range of 10 ppb to 50 ppb (equivalent to drinking water standards) because of the variety of metals found. Therefore, there is a chance that the system could fail resulting in community consumption of water below drinking water standards. Removal efficiencies and effluent concentrations would depend largely on results determined from pilot studies. After metals treatment, the ground water would be treated through an air stripper and then would be disposed of via direct discharge to the Fall Kill. The design would be based on SPDES requirements which would be the more stringent of the effluent limitation for a Class C water body or the water quality limitation for the Fall Kill. Recent tap-water samples taken from site residents by the New York State Department of Health indicate that metals are not a problem at the tap at this time; however, further aquifer sampling would be conducted to determine the need of metals treatment prior to discharge.

Ground-water extraction and treatment offers long range public health protection against contaminated ground-water consumption. Based on site hydrogeologic conditions, the time required to rehabilitate the aquifer to acceptable limits is estimated to be within 5 to 10 years, assuming no continued contaminated discharges. During the aquifer cleanup period, however, residents within the study area using private wells would continue to be exposed to contaminated ground water. Although the contaminant concentrations would continue to decrease over time, it would take at least 5 to 10 years before aquifer water quality is within acceptable drinking water levels. In the meantime, residents could utilize bottled water as their primary source of potable water for the duration of the cleanup. This, however, would pose a potential health threat through continued exposure to volatile organic compounds via inhalation, as well as the inconvenience to the public of using bottled water.

Aquifer rehabilitation would be accompanied by an annual ground-water monitoring program. The sampling and analysis would be conducted by the Dutchess County Department of Health and would utilize selected RI/FS monitoring wells, and private wells located on the west side of Route 9G and in the area south of Wright Avenue. Analytical data obtained from these wells would serve to demonstrate the progress of the aquifer remediation as well as monitor water quality in areas which were not previously impacted. Ground-water samples would be analyzed for priority pollutant metals and volatile organic parameters.

This alternative does not pose any significant long term adverse environmental impacts through its implementation. Pumping ground water from the aquifer for treatment should result in long range aquifer rehabilitation, subsequently reducing the extent of ground-water contamination. Four stainless steel extraction wells, screened in the surficial aquifer, each pumping continuously at 20 gpm, would be sufficient to contain and capture the contaminant plume. The contamination encountered in the bedrock aquifer will be cleaned up by natural dispersion which will occur upon cleanup of the upper aquifer and vertical gradients producing advective flow from the bedrock aquifer to the upper aquifer. If either the metals or volatile organics removal treatment system should fail temporarily, the water being discharged into the creek would have minimal anticipated impact on both surface-water quality and to segments of the public which may come into contact with the creek through recreational activities. This is primarily true as a result of turbulent stream flow conditions and dilution effects, even during low flow conditions. The present worth cost for this alternative is estimated at \$802,200 with metals removal and air stripping and \$289,800 with air stripping only.

D - Alternative No. 5 - Ground-Water Extraction, Treatment and Discharge As A Public Water Supply

This alternative is similar to Alternative No. 4, with the exception that the treated ground water would be used as a community potable water supply together with the existing Harbour Hills water system. In addition to metals and volatile organics removal to meet Federal and State drinking water standards, treatment would include chlorine injection as a bactericide.

Four extraction wells would be located throughout the study area to capture the contaminant plume as discussed in Alternative No. 4. The wells would be screened in the glacial sand and gravel aquifer and would yield a minimum of 20 gallons per minute (gpm) each. A total of 80 gpm or 115,200 gallons per day (gpd) would be extracted from these wells with the additional water not consumed to be treated and wasted to the Fall Kill prior to chlorination.

Air stripping or carbon adsorption would be the technologies used to produce acceptable levels of volatile organics in the effluent. At a minimum, the ground water would be treated to an effluent concentration of 2 ug/l for vinyl chloride, 5 ug/l for benzene and trichloroethene, 7 ug/l for 1,1,-dichloroethene and 10 ug/l for any other single volatile organic constituent. Extensive pilot testing for metals removal must be conducted prior to actual implementation to determine optimal conditions for the process. Due to the presence of many metals in varying concentrations, removal efficiency to a concentration in the order of magnitude of 10 to 50 ppb may not be achievable. Therefore, if a breakdown in the system occurred, consumers would be drinking water that did not meet drinking water standards. However, recent testing of residential tap-water quality by the New York State Department of Health has indicated that metal contamination is not currently a problem and does not pose a health risk. Further design sampling and pilot testing will determine the need for metals treatment.

Upon treatment, the water would be discharged to the Harbour Hills water system to supplement their existing supply. Upgrading of the Harbour Hills treatment system to NYSDOH guidelines would be the responsibility of the owner of the water system at the time of implementation, although partial funding of said upgrading is included as part of this alternative to account for the increased capacity in need of treatment.

The pumping, treatment and discharge as a community water supply option would provide a high degree of protection to the public against exposure of contaminated ground water and, at the same time, reduce the extent of contamination in the aquifer.

Metal concentrations in the ground water may pose some risk to public health. The ground water would be treated for metals removal prior to distribution. Effluent design concentrations were determined based on Federal primary drinking water regulations. MCLs for cadmium, chromium, lead and arsenic are 10 ug/l, 50 ug/l, 50 ug/l, and 50 ug/l, respectively. The presence of many inorganic constituents in varying concentrations may have an adverse affect on removal efficiency. Federal MCLs may therefore not be achievable on a consistent basis.

This alternative would provide adequate protection against hazards to public health when both volatile organics and metals removal technologies are operating at the design removal efficiencies. However, failure of either of these systems, especially an unexpected breakthrough of VOC and/or toxic metals, would result in public exposure of contaminated ground water via ingestion. Proper management, operation and maintenance of the treatment system and frequent sampling and analysis of the water would help mitigate this risk. However, due to the uncertainties associated with the use of metals removal treatment technologies, safe levels of metals in the drinking water can not be assured. There are no anticipated adverse environmental impacts associated with this remedial action alternative. Pumping and treating the contaminated ground-water plume is a viable form of aquifer rehabilitation, assuming no additional contamination is being released. The present worth cost for this alternative is \$1,558,100 and 1,045,700 with and without metals treatment, respectively.

E - Alternative No. 10 - Provide Public Water Supply To All Private Well Users Within The Study Area

Under this alternative, public water supply would be provided to current private well users within the Haviland study area by extending a water service main from the Harbour Hills water system. An estimated 100 residences, which includes a 65-unit apartment complex, approximately 20 commercial businesses and a public school, would be connected to the community water system.

A new six-inch (6") main would be constructed along the existing easement, across the Fall Kill and onto Haviland Road to provide water service to the study area. The service extension would tie into the Harbour Hills water system's existing 6-inch main on Lawrence Road. The existing 3-inch main servicing the Cedar Gardens apartment complex would be replaced with 1,300 feet of 6-inch main from the existing 6-inch main on Lawrence Road to the intersection of Haviland Road and Sunset Drive. The proposed service extension would provide public water to approximately 35 residential lots, a 65-unit apartment complex, a car wash, approximately 20 commercial businesses, and a public school (figure 10).

The existing Harbour Hills Water Company supplies community water to a total of 214 residences and a 24-unit apartment complex in the Harbour Hills section of the Town of Hyde Park. Current demands on water supply servicing these 238 units is 101,000 gpd. The new calculated average daily demand for both the existing Harbour Hills Water Company plus the extended service to the Haviland study area totals 160,000 gpd.

Water for the Harbour Hills water system is obtained from two production wells located on a two-acre parcel of land on Lawrence Road, east of the Fall Kill. As indicated in the RI, the Fall Kill acts as a hydrogeologic boundary for ground-water flow from the Haviland study area and therefore intercepts the contaminated ground-water plume before impacting the supply wells.

The quality of water obtained from the two Harbour Hills supply wells does not meet current New York State Health Department regulations for iron, manganese and turbidity. The total maximum allowable concentration of iron and manganese collectively must not exceed 0.5 mg/l and the turbidity of the water must not exceed a value of 5 turbidity units throughout the distribution system. The combined iron and manganese concentrations, and the turbidity values detected in the Harbour Hills distribution system currently exceed the allowable New York State Department of Health water quality criteria for community ground-water systems.

Another noted deficiency in the existing community water distribution system is inadequate storage capacity. The existing storage in the Harbour Hills water system, with a capacity of 32,000 gallons, does not meet the minimum storage equal to the design average daily consumption, as required under state regulations. With the extension of the water company to include the Haviland area, the total average daily demand would equal approximately 160,000 gpd. An increase in storage capacity of at least eighty percent (80%) is needed to upgrade the system to conform with state requirements.

This alternative employs proven technologies for extending public water service to the Haviland study area. Based on maximum safe yields obtainable, the existing Harbour Hills water system is capable of providing sufficient water capacity to meet the demands of both the existing water company and the extended service to the Haviland area. The estimated total average daily demand (160,000 gpd) represents approximately forty percent (40%) of the maximum safe yield obtainable (439,000 gpd) from the two Harbour Hills water production wells. The facilities to extend the Harbour Hills community water system into the Haviland study area would require approximately 5,500 feet of six-inch (6") diameter ductile iron pipe, six (6) gate valves, approximately sixty (60) service connections and six (6) six-inch hydrants.

The existing water treatment and distribution system must be upgraded and expanded to meet New York State Department of Health community ground-water requirements. Deficiencies in the existing treatment and distribution system will be corrected using proven effective technologies to meet State design criteria. Proposed technologies for upgrading and expanding the existing Harbourside Hills water supply treatment, storage and distribution system are discussed in detail in the Morris & Andros Feasibility Report (1985), conducted for the Town of Hyde Park. As discussed in the Feasibility Study, the cost of upgrading the Harbourside Hills system will be shared by the Town and EPA/New York State under this action. The contribution by the Town will be approximately 60%, depending upon final design details. Under this action, EPA and New York State are only responsible for that portion of the upgrading allocable to the volume associated with this study area.

This alternative provides a high degree of protection to the public against exposure to contaminated ground water by providing all private well users within the Haviland study area with an alternate community water supply. Residents would no longer be using water from the contaminated plume as a potable or domestic water source.

Impacts to the environment resulting from the implementation of this alternative would consist of fluctuations in the elevation of the water table and local disturbances due to construction and installation of the new service mains. In addition, it would not provide for aquifer restoration.

The fluctuations to the water table elevation are predicted due to the proposed cessation of ground-water withdrawal for residential and commercial use, coincident with the continuation of ground-water recharge through the existing septic systems. The land west of the study area now drains into the Maritje Kill, while the study area and land to the south and east drain into the Fall Kill. Modeled ground-water contours and flow directions (Figures 10 and 11) predict the formation of a local ground water "mound" south of the Haviland Complex leaching fields. This predicted local increase in water table elevation could cause a shift in the ground-water divide toward the east which would result in contaminant migration west of Route 9G and south to the area of Woodfield Avenue. The existing gradients causing contaminant transport south toward Roosevelt Road would be increased, thereby hastening the advance of the contaminant plume. Therefore, this alternative is not considered adequate without aquifer remediation to ensure protection of potentially affected residences to the south and the southwest. Residents to the south and southwest using private wells along and between Route 9G and Sunset Avenue should be monitored semi-annually for potential volatile organic and metals contamination from the Haviland Complex Wells site contamination plume.

as a result of localized ground-water mounding. No significant long-term impacts are anticipated to either the topography or the Fall Kill.

Upon correcting the deficiencies in the existing treatment and distribution system, as recommended in the Morris & Andros Feasibility Report (1985), the Harbours Hills water supply system would be within Federal and State requirements for a community ground-water distribution system.

Monitoring of private residential wells to the south and southwest of the study area for volatile organic and metal contaminants should be implemented by the Dutchess County Department of Health. Sampling and analysis of well water should be conducted on a semi-annual basis. The present worth cost for this alternative is \$1,133,600.

VI. SELECTED REMEDY

A - Description

The selected remedial action for the Haviland Complex site, as presented in Table 9, consists of Alternative No. 2 - Source Control, Alternative No. 4 - Aquifer Restoration and Alternative No. 10 - Alternate Water Supply. All three remedial actions must be implemented in order for the overall remediation plan to be effective. During the design phase of Alternate No. 4 the degree of treatment will be resolved based upon additional ground-water sampling and pilot testing i.e. whether or not metals treatment is necessary.

To reduce the risk of exposure to the public from contaminated ground water, an alternate potable water supply will be implemented by extending service from the neighboring Harbours Hills water distribution system. Residents will no longer be using water drawn from the contaminant plume as a potable or domestic water source. It must be noted that this alternative requires a financial commitment on behalf of the Town to upgrade the Harbours Hills system to a level in compliance with New York State drinking water standards. The costs depicted on Table 9 represent only the EPA/New York State share of the total upgrading costs. Approximately \$500,000 in capital costs is required from the Town to implement this option.

Connection to public water service, however, may result in creating local ground-water mounds, causing migration of the existing contaminant plume into previously unaffected areas to the south and southwest of the site. In order to alleviate the potential of further spreading of contaminants and to provide a means for aquifer restoration, ground-water extraction wells will be installed to pump the contaminated ground water for treatment and ultimate discharge of the treated ground water to

the Fall Kill.

The use of four ground-water extraction wells, three placed roughly along the center line of the inferred plume, and the fourth placed to the south-southwest of the study area will be utilized to capture altered contaminant flow caused by ground-water mounding. The calculated pumping rate of 20 gpm for each well should be sufficient for containing the contaminant plume.

Treatment of the contaminated ground water will require volatile organics and possibly inorganic contaminants removal. Use of a packed tower air stripper was chosen for volatile organics removal based on a present worth calculation of capital and O&M costs, as compared to use of granular activated carbon. Metals removal, if deemed necessary, will utilize a precipitation system. Additional ground-water quality samples will be analyzed during the design phase pilot study to identify and better quantify the presence of inorganics, in order to determine the need and extent of a metals removal system.

Aquifer restoration through pumping and treating will meet all Federal and State ARARs and is expected to be accomplished in 5 to 10 years. Aquifer remediation alone will not provide the private well users within the study area with acceptable potable water during the time period above; therefore, it is necessary to extend the Harbourside Hills water supply system to all impacted water users to provide protection to human health during this time frame.

In order for the ground-water pumping and treatment to effectively remediate the aquifer, source controls will need to be implemented from the outset. Source control measures consist of pumping and cleaning out contaminated sediments from local septic disposal systems in order to minimize the potential of additional releases. In addition, it is recommended that the County and/or State utilize all available authority to prevent a recurrence of such a problem through a septic tank monitoring and cleanup program.

A combination of Alternatives No. 2, 4, and 10 meets feasibility study objectives by providing an alternate acceptable source of potable water for private well users within the study area, and a cost-effective means of aquifer rehabilitation. The total cost of the remedial action plan is estimated at \$2,033,800 expressed in terms of present worth over a 10-year project period for ground-water treatment and a 30-year project for public water service. Estimated capital costs are \$1,257,500 and annual operating and maintenance costs are \$105,500 for this remedial action plan.


B - Statutory Determinations

The selected remedy meets statutory requirements by:

1. Reducing public exposure to contaminated ground water by providing an alternate water supply.
2. Rehabilitating the aquifer by pumping and treating ground water to drinking water standards, source control, and preventing surface-water contamination by the discharge of contaminated ground water to the Fall Kill.

The remedy will meet all Federal and State ARARS by utilizing standards from the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) which include the MCLs (maximum contaminant levels), New York Class GA Ground Water Standards and New York State Surface Water Quality Standards, and the Clean Water Act (CWA) which include ambient water quality criteria for surface and ground-water discharges and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). References for the list of contaminant-specific ARARS can be found in the Feasibility Study.

The principal environmental threats posed at the site are various volatile organic compounds and inorganic constituents (metals) in ground water. The threat of metal contamination to the public is not expected to be significant based upon results from recent tap-water samples. The remedy will utilize a combination of permanent solutions and treatment technologies to the maximum extent practicable which include source control (cleaning septic systems), alternate potable water supply (extending municipal water distribution system), extraction and treatment of contaminants in ground water by a metals precipitation method and/or air stripping for volatile organic compounds. This remedy represents the best combination of factors to achieve the preference for treatment to the maximum extent practicable. The selected remedy is also cost-effective and utilizes treatment technologies to the maximum extent practicable.



18
 350
 100
 200
 300
 400
 500
 600
 700
 800
 900
 1000
 1100
 1200
 1300
 1400
 1500
 1600
 1700
 1800
 1900
 2000
 2100
 2200
 2300
 2400
 2500
 2600
 2700
 2800
 2900
 3000
 3100
 3200
 3300
 3400
 3500
 3600
 3700
 3800
 3900
 4000
 4100
 4200
 4300
 4400
 4500
 4600
 4700
 4800
 4900
 5000
 5100
 5200
 5300
 5400
 5500
 5600
 5700
 5800
 5900
 6000
 6100
 6200
 6300
 6400
 6500
 6600
 6700
 6800
 6900
 7000
 7100
 7200
 7300
 7400
 7500
 7600
 7700
 7800
 7900
 8000
 8100
 8200
 8300
 8400
 8500
 8600
 8700
 8800
 8900
 9000
 9100
 9200
 9300
 9400
 9500
 9600
 9700
 9800
 9900
 10000
 10100
 10200
 10300
 10400
 10500
 10600
 10700
 10800
 10900
 11000
 11100
 11200
 11300
 11400
 11500
 11600
 11700
 11800
 11900
 12000
 12100
 12200
 12300
 12400
 12500
 12600
 12700
 12800
 12900
 13000
 13100
 13200
 13300
 13400
 13500
 13600
 13700
 13800
 13900
 14000
 14100
 14200
 14300
 14400
 14500
 14600
 14700
 14800
 14900
 15000
 15100
 15200
 15300
 15400
 15500
 15600
 15700
 15800
 15900
 16000
 16100
 16200
 16300
 16400
 16500
 16600
 16700
 16800
 16900
 17000
 17100
 17200
 17300
 17400
 17500
 17600
 17700
 17800
 17900
 18000
 18100
 18200
 18300
 18400
 18500
 18600
 18700
 18800
 18900
 19000
 19100
 19200
 19300
 19400
 19500
 19600
 19700
 19800
 19900
 20000
 20100
 20200
 20300
 20400
 20500
 20600
 20700
 20800
 20900
 21000
 21100
 21200
 21300
 21400
 21500
 21600
 21700
 21800
 21900
 22000
 22100
 22200
 22300
 22400
 22500
 22600
 22700
 22800
 22900
 23000
 23100
 23200
 23300
 23400
 23500
 23600
 23700
 23800
 23900
 24000
 24100
 24200
 24300
 24400
 24500
 24600
 24700
 24800
 24900
 25000
 25100
 25200
 25300
 25400
 25500
 25600
 25700
 25800
 25900
 26000
 26100
 26200
 26300
 26400
 26500
 26600
 26700
 26800
 26900
 27000
 27100
 27200
 27300
 27400
 27500
 27600
 27700
 27800
 27900
 28000
 28100
 28200
 28300
 28400
 28500
 28600
 28700
 28800
 28900
 29000
 29100
 29200
 29300
 29400
 29500
 29600
 29700
 29800
 29900
 30000
 30100
 30200
 30300
 30400
 30500
 30600
 30700
 30800
 30900
 31000
 31100
 31200
 31300
 31400
 31500
 31600
 31700
 31800
 31900
 32000
 32100
 32200
 32300
 32400
 32500
 32600
 32700
 32800
 32900
 33000
 33100
 33200
 33300
 33400
 33500
 33600
 33700
 33800
 33900
 34000
 34100
 34200
 34300
 34400
 34500
 34600
 34700
 34800
 34900
 35000
 35100
 35200
 35300
 35400
 35500
 35600
 35700
 35800
 35900
 36000
 36100
 36200
 36300
 36400
 36500
 36600
 36700
 36800
 36900
 37000
 37100
 37200
 37300
 37400
 37500
 37600
 37700
 37800
 37900
 38000
 38100
 38200
 38300
 38400
 38500
 38600
 38700
 38800
 38900
 39000
 39100
 39200
 39300
 39400
 39500
 39600
 39700
 39800
 39900
 40000
 40100
 40200
 40300
 40400
 40500
 40600
 40700
 40800
 40900
 41000
 41100
 41200
 41300
 41400
 41500
 41600
 41700
 41800
 41900
 42000
 42100
 42200
 42300
 42400
 42500
 42600
 42700
 42800
 42900
 43000
 43100
 43200
 43300
 43400
 43500
 43600
 43700
 43800
 43900
 44000
 44100
 44200
 44300
 44400
 44500
 44600
 44700
 44800
 44900
 45000
 45100
 45200
 45300
 45400
 45500
 45600
 45700
 45800
 45900
 46000
 46100
 46200
 46300
 46400
 46500
 46600
 46700
 46800
 46900
 47000
 47100
 47200
 47300
 47400
 47500
 47600
 47700
 47800
 47900
 48000
 48100
 48200
 48300
 48400
 48500
 48600
 48700
 48800
 48900
 49000
 49100
 49200
 49300
 49400
 49500
 49600
 49700
 49800
 49900
 50000
 50100
 50200
 50300
 50400
 50500
 50600
 50700
 50800
 50900
 51000
 51100
 51200
 51300
 51400
 51500
 51600
 51700
 51800
 51900
 52000
 52100
 52200
 52300
 52400
 52500
 52600
 52700
 52800
 52900
 53000
 53100
 53200
 53300
 53400
 53500
 53600
 53700
 53800
 53900
 54000
 54100
 54200
 54300
 54400
 54500
 54600
 54700
 54800
 54900
 55000
 55100
 55200
 55300
 55400
 55500
 55600
 55700
 55800
 55900
 56000
 56100
 56200
 56300
 56400
 56500
 56600
 56700
 56800
 56900
 57000
 57100
 57200
 57300
 57400
 57500
 57600
 57700
 57800
 57900
 58000
 58100
 58200
 58300
 58400
 58500
 58600
 58700
 58800
 58900
 59000
 59100
 59200
 59300
 59400
 59500
 59600
 59700
 59800
 59900
 60000
 60100
 60200
 60300
 60400
 60500
 60600
 60700
 60800
 60900
 61000
 61100
 61200
 61300
 61400
 61500
 61600
 61700
 61800
 61900
 62000
 62100
 62200
 62300
 62400
 62500
 62600
 62700
 62800
 62900
 63000
 63100
 63200
 63300
 63400
 63500
 63600
 63700
 63800
 63900
 64000
 64100
 64200
 64300
 64400
 64500
 64600
 64700
 64800
 64900
 65000
 65100
 65200
 65300
 65400
 65500
 65600
 65700
 65800
 65900
 66000
 66100
 66200
 66300
 66400
 66500
 66600
 66700
 66800
 66900
 67000
 67100
 67200
 67300
 67400
 67500
 67600
 67700
 67800
 67900
 68000
 68100
 68200
 68300
 68400
 68500
 68600
 68700
 68800
 68900
 69000
 69100
 69200
 69300
 69400
 69500
 69600
 69700
 69800
 69900
 70000
 70100
 70200
 70300
 70400
 70500
 70600
 70700
 70800
 70900
 71000
 71100
 71200
 71300
 71400
 71500
 71600
 71700
 71800
 71900
 72000
 72100
 72200
 72300
 72400
 72500
 72600
 72700
 72800
 72900
 73000
 73100
 73200
 73300
 73400
 73500
 73600
 73700
 73800
 73900
 74000
 74100
 74200
 74300
 74400
 74500
 74600
 74700
 74800
 74900
 75000
 75100
 75200
 75300
 75400
 75500
 75600
 75700
 75800
 75900
 76000
 76100
 76200
 76300
 76400
 76500
 76600
 76700
 76800
 76900
 77000
 77100
 77200
 77300
 77400
 77500
 77600
 77700
 77800
 77900
 78000
 78100
 78200
 78300
 78400
 78500
 78600
 78700
 78800
 78900
 79000
 79100
 79200
 79300
 79400
 79500
 79600
 79700
 79800
 79900
 80000
 80100
 80200
 80300
 80400
 80500
 80600
 80700
 80800
 80900
 81000
 81100
 81200
 81300
 81400
 81500
 81600
 81700
 81800
 81900
 82000
 82100
 82200
 82300
 82400
 82500
 82600
 82700
 82800
 82900
 83000
 83100
 83200
 83300
 83400
 83500
 83600
 83700
 83800
 83900
 84000
 84100
 84200
 84300
 84400
 84500
 84600
 84700
 84800
 84900
 85000
 85100
 85200
 85300
 85400
 85500
 85600
 85700
 85800
 85900
 86000
 86100
 86200
 86300
 86400
 86500
 86600
 86700
 86800
 86900
 87000
 87100
 87200
 87300
 87400
 87500
 87600
 87700
 87800
 87900
 88000
 88100
 88200
 88300
 88400
 88500
 88600
 88700
 88800
 88900
 89000
 89100
 89200
 89300
 89400
 89500
 89600
 89700
 89800
 89900
 90000
 90100
 90200
 90300
 90400
 90500
 90600
 90700
 90800
 90900
 91000
 91100
 91200
 91300
 91400
 91500
 91600
 91700
 91800
 91900
 92000
 92100
 92200
 92300
 92400
 92500
 92600
 92700
 92800
 92900
 93000
 93100
 93200
 93300
 93400
 93500
 93600
 93700
 93800
 93900
 94000
 94100
 94200
 94300
 94400
 94500
 94600
 94700
 94800
 94900
 95000
 95100
 95200
 95300
 95400
 95500
 95600
 95700
 95800
 95900
 96000
 96100
 96200
 96300
 96400
 96500
 96600
 96700
 96800
 96900
 97000
 97100
 97200
 97300
 97400
 97500
 97600
 97700
 97800
 97900
 98000
 98100
 98200
 98300
 98400
 98500
 98600
 98700
 98800
 98900
 99000
 99100
 99200
 99300
 99400
 99500
 99600
 99700
 99800
 99900
 100000
 100100
 100200
 100300
 100400
 100500
 100600
 100700
 100800
 100900
 101000
 101100
 101200
 101300
 101400
 101500
 101600
 101700
 101800
 101900
 102000
 102100
 102200
 102300
 102400
 102500
 102600
 102700
 102800
 102900
 103000
 103100
 103200
 103300
 103400
 103500
 103600
 103700
 103800
 103900
 104000
 104100
 104200
 104300
 104400
 104500
 104600
 104700
 104800
 104900
 105000
 105100
 105200
 105300
 105400
 105500
 105600
 105700
 105800
 105900
 106000
 106100
 106200
 106300
 106400
 106500
 106600
 106700
 106800
 106900
 107000
 107100
 107200
 107300
 107400
 107500
 107600
 107700
 107800
 107900
 108000
 108100
 108200
 108300
 108400
 108500
 108600
 108700
 108800
 108900
 109000
 109100
 109200
 109300
 109400
 109500
 109600
 109700
 109800
 109900
 110000
 110100
 110200
 110300
 110400
 110500
 110600
 110700
 110800
 110900
 111000
 111100
 111200
 111300
 111400
 111500
 111600
 111700
 111800
 111900
 112000
 112100
 112200
 112300
 112400
 112500
 112600
 112700
 112800
 112900
 113000
 113100
 113200
 113300
 113400
 113500
 113600
 113700
 113800
 113900
 114000
 114100
 114200
 114300
 114400
 114500
 114600
 114700
 114800
 114900
 115000
 115100
 115200
 115300
 115400
 115500
 115600
 115700
 115800
 115900
 116000
 116100
 116200
 116300
 116400
 116500
 116600
 116700
 116800
 116900
 117000
 117100
 117200
 117300
 117400
 117500
 117600
 117700
 117800
 117900
 118000
 118100
 118200
 118300
 118400
 118500
 118600




Figure 3




Figure 4







Figure 6







WELLS ARE
NOTED BY
NUMBERS 1-7

HOLZWACHER, McLENDON & MURRELL, P.C.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS, 1111 N. 1ST ST., SUITE 100, DENVER, CO 80202

11/2/88

Figure 9







Figure 10







INORGANIC WATER QUALITY RESULTS FOR ROUNDS ONE AND TWO SHALLOW WELL 3

SAMPLE NO.	29-u	26-u	27-u	28-u	25-u	24-u	18-u	22-u	19-u	20-u	23-u	16-u
DETERGENT	ND	ND	0.18	ND	ND	0.06	ND	ND	ND	0.05	1.3	0.66
CHLORIDE (mg/l)	45	53	71	119	162	72	232	132	176	300	0.25	ND
PHENOLS (mg/l)	1.2	ND	ND	ND	ND	1.2	ND	ND	ND	3.6	21	ND
NO ₃ & NO ₂ (mg/l)	0.3	5.7	0.1	0.2	2.4	19	3.2	2.7	0.2	ND	2.8	ND
CYANIDE (mg/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	10.5	12.7	3.3	0.8	ND	ND	ND
ANTIMONY (mg/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
ARSENIC (mg/l)	77	68	563	246	104	ND	218	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
BERYLLIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CADMIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CHROMIUM (ug/l)	60	70	140	130	22	30	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
COPPER (ug/l)	430	220	510	328	487	22	369	384	ND	ND	ND	ND
LEAD (ug/l)	350	170	500	450	320	31	420	60	ND	ND	ND	ND
MERCURY (ug/l)	1.1	0.4	1	1.4	1.4	18	350	110	ND	ND	ND	ND
NICKEL (ug/l)	180	80	1.8	1.2	ND	ND	1.2	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
SILVER (ug/l)	102	182	347	216	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
THALLIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TIN (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
ZINC (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
pH	6.5	7.5	6.2	6.5	7	7.1	6.6	6.9	6.7	7.2	7.7	7.5

N - SPIKE RECOVERY LESS THAN 75%
 B - ALTERNATE MEASUREMENT WAS USED
 +E - SUSPECTED INTERFERENCE
 * - INTERFERES DUE TO PARTICULATES

ND - LESS THAN DETECTION

For each water quality parameter:
 Round I in the first line; Round II
 in the second line.

HOLZMACHER, McLENDON & MURRELL, P.C.
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTISTS, ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS

MINNESOTA
 PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
 LICENSE NO. 100,000,000

- DPIKE RECOVERY LESS THAN 75%
- ALTERNATE MGA PROCEDURE WAS USED
- SUSPECTED INTERFERENCES
- INTERFERENCES DUE TO PARTICULATES
- LESS THAN DETECTION

SAMPLING LOCATION	29-B	29-DD	26-B	27-D	27-B	28-D	25-B	DRY WELL
DETERGENT	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.09	ND	ND	1.15
CHLORIDE	ND	ND	14	59	42	33	ND	0.46
PHENOLS	ND	ND	1.6	41	40	37	ND	3350
NO3 & NO2 (ug/l)	3.2	1	0.1	ND	1.2	ND	ND	1770
CYANIDE (ug/l)	3.2	ND	4.5	ND	0.2	ND	ND	ND
ANTIMONY	ND	ND	0.7	4.7	1.8	ND	ND	4.4
ARSENIC (ug/l)	13.8	ND	ND	ND	0.2	ND	ND	0.3
BERYLLIUM (ug/l)	21	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CADMIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CHROMIUM (ug/l)	ND	NE	ND	NE	ND	ND	ND	67
COFFER (ug/l)	60	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	17
LEAD (ug/l)	119	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	130
MERCURY (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	256
NICKEL (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	3560
SELENIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	132
SILVER (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	122
THYLLIUM (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	300
ZINC (ug/l)	69	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.4
	7.4	7.6	8.1	7.7	9.5	7.1	8.7	7.4

For each water quality parameter:
Round 1 is the first line; Round 2
is the second line.

SIGNIFICANT VOLATILE ORGANIC WATER QUALITY RESULTS FOR BOUNDS ONE AND TWO
SHALLOW WELLS

SAMPLING LOCATION	29-a	26-a	27-a	28-a	25-a	24-a	18-a	22-a	19-a	20-a	23-a	21-a	16-a
1,1-DICHLOROETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	B 17	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TRANS-1,2-DICHLOROETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	B 11	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
1,1,1-TRICHLOROETHANE (ug/l)	B 7	ND	B 28	B 6	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
ACETONE (ug/l)	ND	B 21	B 104	B 10	B 12	B 9	ND	B 12	B 12	ND	ND	B 17	ND
CHLOROMETHANE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TOLUENE (ug/l)	ND	B 6	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
METHYLENE CHLORIDE (ug/l)	ND	ND	B 5	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
BENZENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	B 11	ND	ND	ND
CARBON DISULFIDE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TOTAL XYLENES (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
CHLORO BENZENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
2-BUTANONE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TETRACHLOROETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
ETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

For each water quality parameter:
Round 1 is the first line; Round 2 is the second line.

SIGNIFICANT VOLATILE ORGANIC GROUND WATER QUALITY RESULTS FOR ROUNDS ONE AND TWO
DEEP AND BEDROCK WELLSB - CORRECTED FOR BLANK
CONTAMINATION
ND - LESS THAN DETECTION

SAMPLING LOCATION	29-D	29-DD	26-D	27-D	27-B	28-D	25-B	25-D
1,1-DICHLORO ETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	B 46	ND	ND	ND
TRANS-1,2-DICHLORO ETHENE (ug/l)	6	ND	ND	ND	22	ND	ND	ND
1,1,1-TRICHLORO ETHANE (ug/l)	9	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
ACETONE (ug/l)	ND	B 13	B 7	B 8	B 52	ND	ND	ND
CHLOROMETHANE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	35
TOLUENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	B 27	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
METHYLENE CHLORIDE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
BENZENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	B 5	ND	B 5	ND	ND	ND
CARBON DISULFIDE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TOTAL XYLENES (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	17
CHLORO BENZENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	19
2-BUTANONE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
TETRACHLORO ETHENE (ug/l)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

For each water quality parameter:

Round I is the first line; Round II is the second line


HOLZMACHER, McLENDON & MURRELL, P.C.
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTISTS, ARCHITECTS and PLANNERS


 MELVILLE, N.Y.
 FARMINGDALE, N.Y.
 RIVERHEAD, N.Y.
 FAIRFIELD, N.J.

**INORGANIC WATER QUALITY RESULTS FOR
ROUNDS ONE AND TWO -FALL KILL**

N - SPIKE RECOVERY LESS THAN 75%
S - ALTERNATE MSA PROCEDURE WAS USED
+E - SUSPECTED INTERFERENCES
* - INTERFERENCES DUE TO PARTICULATES
ND - LESS THAN DETECTION

SAMPLING LOCATION	PT-1	PT-2	PT-3	PT-3A	PT-4	PT-5
DETERGENT	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(MBAS)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
CHLORIDE	30	44	43		30	32
(mg/l)	19	20		23	21	21
PHENOLS	ND	1.2	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	2		ND	2.4	0.5
NO3 & NO2	0.7	0.6	0.6		0.7	0.7
(mg/l)	0.7	0.7		0.8	0.8	0.8
CYANIDE	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
ANTIMONY	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	78	ND		ND	ND	ND
ARSENIC	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
BERYLIUM	N ND	N ND	N ND		N ND	N ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
CADMIUM	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	6	ND		7	ND	5
CHROMIUM	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
COPPER	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		30	ND	25
LEAD	ND	7	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		15.6	ND	ND
MERCURY	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		NE	ND	0.4
NICKEL	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
SELENIUM	N ND	N ND	N ND		N ND	N ND
(ug/l)	ND	ND		ND	ND	ND
SILVER	ND	ND	ND		ND	ND
(ug/l)	NE 10	NE 10		NE 15	NE 10	NE ND
THALIUM	N ND	N ND	N ND		N ND	N ND
(ug/l)	NE 10	NE 10		NE ND	NE ND	NE ND
ZINC	ND	40	50		ND	ND
(mg/l)	ND	ND		56	ND	ND
pH	7.4	7.3	7.5		7.1	7.3
	7.2	7.1		7	7.1	7.1

For each water quality parameter:
Round I is the first line; Round II
is the second line.



HOLZMACHER, McLENDON & MURRELL, P.C.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTISTS, ARCHITECTS and PLANNERS

MELVILLE, N.Y.
FARMINGDALE, N.Y.
RIVERHEAD, N.Y.
BALTIMORE, N.D.

TABLE 5

ORGANIC ANALYSIS (ug/l)

SEPTIC SYSTEM SAMPLING

HAVILAND COMPLEX WELLS SITE

Compound	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5	S-6	S-7
Chloromethane	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Bromomethane	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Vinyl Chloride	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Chloroethane	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Methylene Chloride	4 JB	6 B	1 JB	2 B	4 JB	3 JB	3 JB
Acetone	73	10 U	26	72	9 J	14	11
Carbon Disulfate	6	2 JB	13 B	2 B	14	15	12
1,1-Dichloroethene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1-Dichloroethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trans-1,2-Dichloroethene	5 U	1 J	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Chloroform	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,2-Dichloroethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
2-Butanone	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Carbon Tetrachloride	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Vinyl Acetate	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Bromodichloromethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,2-Dichloropropane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trichloroethene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Dibromochloromethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Benzene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
2-Chloroethylvinylether	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Bromoform	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
2-Hexanone	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Tetrachloroethene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Toluene	41 B	44 B	170 B	340 B	92 B	340 B	270 B
Chlorobenzene	5 U	1 JB	23 B	2 JB	1 JB	1 JB	5 U
Ethylbenzene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Styrene	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Total Xylenes	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	3	5 U
Dichlorobenzene	20 U	10 U	11	20 U	20 U	50 U	10 U

U - undetected

J - incomplete recovery

B - found in blank

TABLE 6 CONT'D

ORGANIC ANALYSIS (ug/l) (CONT'D.)

SEPTIC SYSTEM SAMPLING

HAVILAND COMPLEX WELLS SITE

Compound	S-8	S-9	S-10	S-11	S-12	S-13	S-14
Chloromethane	10 U	500 U	10 U	5 J	5 J	5 J	6 J
Bromomethane	10 U	500 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Vinyl Chloride	10 U	500 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Chloroethane	10 U	500 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Methylene Chloride	4 JB	130 JB	2 JB	3 JB	2 JB	2 JB	2 JB
Acetone	38	900 B	13 B	97 B	14 B	610 B	120 B
Carbon Disulfate	11	200 JB	2 JB	26 B	20 B	38 B	40 B
1,1-Dichloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1-Dichloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trans-1,2-Dichloroethane	25	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Chloroform	1 J	250 U	5 U	2 J	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,2-Dichloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
2-Butanone	10 U	500 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	460	10 U
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Carbon Tetrachloride	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Vinyl Acetate	10 U	250 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	9 J	10 U
Bromodichloromethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,2-Dichloropropane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Trichloroethene		250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Dibromochloromethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Benzene	5 U	510 B	11 B	11 B	8 B	9 B	8 B
Cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
2-Chloroethylvinylether	10 U	250 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	10 U
Bromoform	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
4-Methyl-2-Pentanone	10 U	250 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	6 JB	10 U
2-Hexanone	10 U	250 U	10 U	10 U	10 U	810	21
Tetrachloroethene	6	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Toluene	120 B	77 JB	3 JB	46 B	2 JB	1900 B	7 B
Chlorobenzene	5 U	250 U	2 J	15 B	5 U	5 U	5 U
Ethylbenzene	6	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	3 J	16
Styrene	5 U	250 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U	5 U
Total Xylenes	63	250 U	2 B	4 B	5 U	10 B	92 B
Dichlorobenzene	400 U	20 U	20 U	31	20 U	10 U	10 U

U - undetected

J - incomplete recovery

B - found in blank

TABLE 7

INORGANIC ANALYSIS (ug/l)

SEPTIC SYSTEM SAMPLING

HAYLAND COMPLEX WELLS SITE

Parameter	S-1	S-2	S-3	S-4	S-5	S-6	S-7	Federal MCLs	NYS Class CA Groundwater Discharge Standards
Detergent (MEAS)	1#	0.73#	1.66#	1.76#	1.83#	2.08#	1.2#	—	—
Chloride	220#	230#	260#	230#	240#	230#	240#	—	2
Phenols	21	16	124	120	46	76	86	—	10
NO ₂ -N + NO ₃ -N	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	—	—
Cyanide	27	12	42	14	20	42	23	—	—
Antimony	<60	<60	<60	68	76	90	62	—	—
Arsenic	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	29.7 NE	<10 NE	50	50
Beryllium	<5	16	8	<5	5	<5	<5	—	—
Cadmium	20	33	10	<5	<5	25	<5	10	20
Chromium	24	34	16	<10	14	67	<10	—0	—
Copper	2570	2750	291	310	209	8870	172	50	100
Lead	110	<5	<5	<5	<5	430	<5	—	1000
Mercury	330 NE	0.2 NE	0.2 NE	0.3 NE	0.2 NE	0.2 NE	<0.2 NE	50	50
Nickel	71	<40	<40	<40	<40	146	<40	2	4
Selenium	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	14 NE	<5 NE	—	—
Silver	102	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	10	10	40
Thallium	<10 NE	<10 NE	<100 NE	<100 NE	<10 NE	<100 NE	<100 NE	50	100
Zinc	2550	356	644	154	146	6310	115	—	5000

-37-

All results are in ug/l except when denoted by "#" (mg/l)

- - Spike recovery not within control limits

- - Estimated value due to interference

TABLE 7 (CONT'D)

INORGANIC ANALYSIS (ug/l) (CONT'D.)

SEPTIC SYSTEM SAMPLING

HAYLAND COMPLEX WELLS SITE

Parameter	S-8	S-9	S-10	S-11	S-12	S-13	S-14	Federal MCLs	NYS Class CA Groundwater Discharge Standards
Detergent (MBAS)	1.6#	0.38#	<0.04#	0.34#	<0.04#	2.24#	<0.04#	—	—
Chloride	230#	210#	<2#	108#	15#	99#	1180#	—	—
Phenols	20	15	<1	59	4	74	<1	—	2
NO ₂ -N + NO ₃ -N	<0.1#	1.9#	1.9#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	<0.1#	—	10
Cyanide	70	173	<10	27	<10	20	<10	—	—
Antimony	172	64	<60	<60	<60	<60	130	—	—
Arsenic	<200 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<200 NE	50	50
Beryllium	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	<5	—	—
Cadmium	66	<5	<5	<5	<5	5	97	10	20
Chromium	328	21	11	<10	<10	25	216	—	—
Copper	10600	80	1410	62	69	434	723	50	100
Lead	1840	270	270	<50	<50	140	1400	—	1000
Mercury	38 NE	0.6 NE	<0.2 NE	0.2 NE	0.6 NE	1.0 NE	0.6 NE	50	50
Nickel	198	<40	<40	<40	<40	50	299	2	4
Selenium	<100 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<5 NE	<100 NE	—	—
Silver	12	16	<10	<10	<10	12	<10	10	40
Thallium	<10 NE	<100 NE	<10 NE	<100 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	<10 NE	50	100
Zinc	12700	281	356	99	120	985	3710	—	5000

-38-

All results are in ug/l except when denoted by "# (mg/l)


N - Spike recovery not within control limits

E - Estimated value due to interference

TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION
OF NAVILAND COMPLEX WELLS SITE
REMEDIAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE	CAPITAL COST	ANNUAL O&M	TOTAL PRESENT WORTH	NO. OF YEARS OF REMEDIAL ACTION IMPLEMENTATION
NO.1 - NO ACTION	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	N/A
NO.2 - SOURCE CONTROL	98,000	- 0 -	98,000	0
NO.4 - GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION, TREATMENT AND DISCHARGE TO SURFACE WATERS				
A - METALS REMOVAL ONLY	273,000	47,000	341,800	10
B - AIR STRIPPING ONLY	170,000	19,500	289,800	10
C - GRANULAR ACTIVATED CARBON ONLY	175,000	44,000	445,400	10
A+B - METALS REMOVAL ** AND AIR STRIPPING	393,600	66,500	802,200	10
A+C - METALS REMOVAL ** AND GAC	400,600	91,000	959,800	10
NO.5 - GROUNDWATER EXTRACTION, TREATMENT AND DISCHARGE AS A PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY				10 YRS. FOR TREATMENT/ 30 YRS. FOR PUBLIC WATER SERVICE
A - METALS REMOVAL ONLY	661,200	84,000	1,317,700	10 / 30
B - AIR STRIPPING ONLY	558,200	58,500	1,045,700	10 / 30
C - GAC ONLY	543,200	83,000	1,201,300	10 / 30
A+B - METALS REMOVAL ** AND AIR STRIPPING	781,800	105,000	1,558,100	10 / 30
A+C - METALS REMOVAL ** AND GAC	788,800	130,000	1,715,700	10 / 30
NO.10 - PROVIDE PUBLIC ** WATER SUPPLY TO ALL PRIVATE WELL USERS WITHIN THE STUDY AREA	765,900	39,000	1,133,600	30

** - INCLUDE MISC. AND CONTINGENCY COSTS



HOLZMACHER, McLENDON & MURRELL, P.C.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS, ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTISTS, ARCHITECTS and PLANNERS

MELVILLE, N.Y.
FARMINGDALE, N.Y.
FAIRFIELD, N.J.

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF SELECTED REMEDY AND COSTS

<u>Recommended Remedial Action Plan No. IV</u>	<u>Capital Cost (\$)</u>	<u>Operation & Maintenance Costs (\$/yr)</u>	<u>Number of Years of Implementation</u>	<u>Present Worth (\$)</u>
No.2 Source Control	\$ 98,000	\$ -0-	-	\$ 98,000
No.4 A Groundwater Extraction, Treatment (metals removal and air stripping) and discharge to Surface Water	393,600	66,500	10	802,200
No.10 Provide Public Water Supply to all private well users within the study area	765,900	39,000	30	1,133,600
TOTAL	\$1,257,500	\$105,500		\$2,033,800

-41-
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
50 Wolf Road, Albany, New York 12233

EPA-REGION II
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY &
REMEDIAL RESPONSE

1987 SEP 16 PM 12:20

DIRECTOR
SEP 11 1987

Thomas C. Jorling
Commissioner

TELEX

Mr. Stephen D. Luftig
Director
Office of Emergency and Remedial Response
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region II
26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10278

Dear Mr. Luftig:

Re: Haviland Complex Wells Site
Hyde Park (T), Dutchess County
Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study


The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) has recently completed a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at the Haviland Complex Wells Site, Town of Hyde Park, Dutchess County, New York.

This RI/FS work recommended that the following remedial measures be implemented at this site: 1) source control [Alternative No. 2]; 2) groundwater extraction, treatment and discharge to the Fall Kill Creek [Alternative Nos. 4A&B]; and 3) providing public water [Alternative No. 10] by extending the Harbour Hills Water System to all private well users within the study area. This Department endorses these recommendations.

We understand that: 1) the remedial costs for this project, including the operation and maintenance costs for Alternative Nos. 4A&B for a ten-year period, will be divided 90% federal and 10% State of New York; and 2) that the State of New York will be responsible for assuring the operation and maintenance of Alternative No. 10. We understand that the first year operation and maintenance costs will be eligible for federal funding.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Robert Foltin or Mr. Joseph Iannotti, of my staff, at (518) 457-1708.

Sincerely,


Norman H. Nosenchuck, P.E.
Director
Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste

cc: G. Pavlou, USEPA Region II
W. McCabe, USEPA Region II
A. Posner, USEPA Region II

Responsiveness Summary
Haviland Complex Wells Site

Q: Which direction is the ground-water flow in the Haviland area? Will ground water flow in a southwest direction towards Woodfield Avenue once the preferred alternatives are implemented?

A: Ground water is basically flowing in a southeast direction from the Haviland Complex towards the Fall Kill Creek. The ground-water flow pattern could change should an alternate water supply be used. Connection to public water may result in creating local ground-water mounds and migration of the existing contaminant plume into previously unaffected areas to the south and southwest of the site. In order to alleviate the potential of further spreading of contaminants and to provide a means for aquifer rehabilitation, ground-water extraction wells would be installed to pump the contaminated ground water to a treatment system.

Q: Is the water from the Harboured Hills wells drinkable?

A: The Harboured Hills water is drinkable but does contain iron and manganese levels slightly above the State Health Department standards. The planned remedial action includes upgrading of the Harboured Hills treatment system to reduce the iron and manganese levels to a point that would meet the requirements of the State Health Department.

Q: Where are the homeowner sampling results from the August 1986 sampling episode performed by the EPA?

A: The results are contained in the Feasibility Study document and they can also be obtained from the Dutchess County Health Department and/or the USEPA.

Q: Why can't the Hyde Park Village Water System be extended to the Haviland area?

A: The implementation of this district to serve the entire town is at least two to three years in the future according to local officials. If this district is established in the future, then the system at Harboured Hills could serve as back-up. Upgrading and extension of the Harboured Hills water system appears to be a more cost-effective alternative than the establishment of the Hyde Park Water District.

Q: Why weren't the homeowner septic tanks tested to find out if they were contaminating the ground water in the area?

A: Because of the relatively insignificant quantity of flow associated with private homeowners, the residential septic tanks were not tested during the study. Due to the insignificant flows associated with the residential septic tanks, in the unlikely event of their failure, the resulting contamination would be captured by the extraction and treatment system selected for implementation. Based on pre-RI/FS testing and the flow volumes involved, the study concentrated on the septic tanks of the Haviland apartment complex, Haviland shopping center and Haviland Junior High School. Therefore, monitoring wells were placed immediately downgradient of those septic systems and samples were taken from those septic tanks. Sampling results, both from the monitoring wells and from the septic tanks, indicate volatile organic and metal contamination.

Q: After reviewing the data generated from the study at this site, is it probable that a determination would be made that the pollution was caused by one or more polluters and that legal remedies would be sought against those people?

A: The data in the remedial investigation and feasibility study documents indicate that contamination has emanated from certain point sources. If the government attorneys and technical people decide that enough evidence exists to identify specific polluters responsible for the contamination at this site, then notice letters will be sent to those individuals requesting action on their part.

Q: How long will it take before construction of the preferred alternatives is initiated?

A: The plan is for the design to be funded in the second quarter of federal fiscal year 1988 which would be January through March 1988. Generally, a year would be allocated to complete the design phase since pilot testing of the proposed ground-water treatment system and further ground-water sampling will need to be done during this phase. If this schedule is adhered to, then the start of construction would be in the beginning of calendar year 1989.

Q: Soap is appearing in my well water and I believe it's coming from the Haviland laundromat. Why can't something be done about it?

A: As a follow-up to the septic tank sampling performed in this study, the Dutchess County Health Department and the

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation will investigate and determine what facilities are violating the New York State ground-water discharge standards. Action will be taken accordingly.